Response

The claims were amended in accordance with the amendments above. All of the amendments are fully supported by the specification, claims, and figures as originally filed. No new matter is believed or intended to be involved.

To the extent that the amendments constitute a narrowing of the claims, such narrowing of the claims should not be construed as an admission as to the merits of the prior rejections. Indeed, Applicant traverses the rejections and preserves all rights and arguments.

In the Office Action dated 10/21/2004, claims 13-23 and 36-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Evans, III (US 5,732,231). Claims 24, 25, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Arbuckle (US 5,651,117). Claims 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbuckle (US 5,651,117) in view of Salgado (US 5,831,747). Claims 28-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbuckle (US 5,651,117) in view of Evans, III (US 5,732,231).

Claims 13-38 have been cancelled. As can be seen from the claims, newly added claims 39-63 mark a significant change in focus with respect to the cancelled claims. This change has been made as a business decision to reflect the commercial priorities of the assignee.

Newly added claims 39-63 each recite limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record. For instance, and without limitation, independent claim 39 recites the transmission of information from a transmission location within a cemetery to a person located within the cemetery. Similarly, independent claim 51 recites a transmitter located at a transmission location within a cemetery and a device operable to present at least a portion of the information transmitted from the transmitter to a user located within the cemetery. In addition, independent claim 60 recites

receiving a request for information from a person located within a cemetery and transmitting information to a device located within the cemetery. Applicant further notes that the dependent claims include additional limitations not taught or suggested in the art of record, thus forming independent basis for novelty and non-obviousness. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently amended claims are patentable over the art of record.

Based on the foregoing, all pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and an early notice of allowance.

Respectfully/Submitted,

Victor C. Moreno (Reg. No. 40,732)

FROST BROWN TODD LLC

2200 PNC Center 201 East Fifth Street

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-4182

513-651-6812 (direct)

513-651-6981 (fax)

Certificate of Mailing

The undersigned certifies that this correspondence was deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed to "Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on this 27, day of

January, 2005.

CinLibrary 0103085.0519322 1470051v.1